



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

W
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/725,475	12/03/2003	Mark Zoller	54074D8	4496
21967	7590	09/20/2006	EXAMINER	
HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT 1900 K STREET, N.W. SUITE 1200 WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1109			LANDSMAN, ROBERT S	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1647		

DATE MAILED: 09/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/725,475	ZOLLER ET AL.	
	Examiner Robert Landsman	Art Unit 1647	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on Pre. Amend 9/13/05, 12/2/03.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 194-256 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 194-256 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Formal Matters

- A. The Preliminary Amendments filed 12/2/03 and 9/13/05 have been entered into the record.
- B. Claims 194-256 are pending and are the subject of this Office Action.

2. Oath

The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is required. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

The oath or declaration is defective because: the inventor Jon Alder did not sign the Oath.

3. Specification

- A. The specification is objected to since the status of applications in the first line of the specification should be updated.
- B. The drawings show a Figure 3C. However, this Figure is not referenced in the Brief Description of the Figures.
- C. The Brief Description of Figure 16 does not recite "Figures 16 A and B," for example, in order to correspond to the actual Figures.
- D. The status of application 09/984,292 on page 15 ([0071]) should be updated.

4. Claim Objections

- A. Claim 206 is objected to since "NO." should have a semi-colon instead of a period - as in "NO;"
- B. Claim 207 is objected to since there is excess space between "SEQ ID NO:" and "10."
- C. Claim 217 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent

Art Unit: 1647

form. Both claims limit the SEQ ID NO: to SEQ ID NO:9. It is believed that claim 216 should recite "SEQ ID NO:11." However, if this claim remains examined (i.e. is not withdrawn) this application may be subject to Restriction.

D. Claims 221 and 239-241 are objected to since the syntax could be improved. Applicants should consider amending the phrase "comprised in" since receptors are not actually comprised in membranes inasmuch as membranes comprise the receptors. The same reasoning is used for claims 239-241.

E. Claim 232 is objected to since it should recite "effect of said cell."

F. Claim 233 is objected to since it should depend from claim 232.

G. Claim 242 is objected to since the term "high-throughput" should be hyphenated.

5. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, first paragraph – scope of enablement

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

A. Claims 194-256 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for methods of using the heterodimer of SEQ ID NO:6 and 7 (encoded by SEQ ID NO:9 and 10), does not reasonably provide enablement for methods of screening all sweet taste receptors, including those which hybridize to SEQ ID NO:9 or 10, or for fragments thereof. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

In In re Wands, 8USPQ2d, 1400 (CAFC 1988) page 1404, the factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure would require undue experimentation include (1) the quantity of experimentation necessary, (2) the amount of direction or guidance presented, (3) the presence or absence of working examples, (4) the nature of the invention, (5) the state of the prior art, (6) the relative skill of those in the art, (7) the predictability or unpredictability of the art, and (8) the breadth of the claims.

First, the breadth of the claims is excessive with regard to claiming screening methods using all heteromeric T1R2/T1R3 taste receptors which are activated by sweet taste, including those from **any and all species**. Applicants have only identified SEQ ID NO:6 and 7 form a dimer and are activated by sweet

Art Unit: 1647

taste. Similarly, the breadth is excessive with regard to taste receptors encoded by polynucleotides which “hybridize” under stringent conditions to that of SEQ ID NO:9 or 10, as well as “fragments” thereof of the receptors. Nucleic acid molecules which “hybridize” to those polynucleotides would have one or more nucleic acid substitutions, deletions, insertions and/or additions to said polynucleotides. Similarly, proteins which are “fragments” of the claimed proteins would have one or more amino acid substitutions, deletions, insertions and/or additions to the claimed proteins.

Applicants provide no guidance or working examples of nucleic acid molecules which hybridize to SEQ ID NO:9 or 10, or of proteins which are “fragments” of these proteins. Furthermore, it is not predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art how to make a functional T1R2/T1R3 heterodimer other than that comprising the full-length SEQ ID NO:6 and 7.

In summary, the breadth of the claims is excessive with regard to Applicants claiming all nucleic acids which hybridize to SEQ ID NO:9 or 10, or for proteins which are fragments of these proteins. There is also a lack of guidance and working examples of these nucleic acid molecules and proteins. These factors, along with the lack of predictability to one of ordinary skill in the art as to how to make a functional T1R2/T1R3 heterodimer other than that comprising the full-length SEQ ID NO:6 and 7 leads the Examiner to hold that undue experimentation is necessary to practice the invention as claimed.

B. Claims 194-256 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for methods of screening for compounds which modulate SEQ ID NO:6 and 7 (encoded by SEQ ID NO:9 and 10), does not reasonably provide enablement for methods of screening for compounds which elicit a response in the SEQ ID NO:6/7 dimer. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

As discussed below under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, Applicants have not taught how to determine how the assays of the claims, including 229-238 and 246-254, could be used to demonstrate that a compound has elicited a response. For example, in claim 243 it is not understood what “activation” is being enhanced or inhibited, nor how to determine this activation. Similarly, for claims 245-247, for example, it is not understood what endpoint is being examined, i.e. what activation, or what effect on signal transduction is being identified, or what a change in cellular polarization means. It is not known if the artisan is looking for an increase in polarization, or signal transduction to conclude that the compound elicits a response, etc.

6. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, first paragraph – written description

A. Claims 194-256 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

These are genus claims. The specification only describes screening methods using the T1R2/T1R3 heterodimer comprising SEQ ID NO:6 and 7. Heterodimers from **any other species**, or “**fragments**” of SEQ ID NO:6 or 7 would have one or more amino acid substitutions, deletions, insertions and/or additions to these proteins and have not been described. Similarly, nucleic acid molecules which “**hybridize**” to those polynucleotides of SEQ ID NO:9 or 10 would have one or more nucleic acid substitutions, deletions, insertions and/or additions to said polynucleotides. Similarly, Applicants have not described which residues are critical for protein function

The specification and claims do not indicate what distinguishing attributes are shared by the members of the genus. Thus the scope of the claims includes numerous structural variants, and the genus is highly variant because a significant number of structural differences between genus members is permitted. The specification and claims do not provide any guidance as to what changes should be made. Structural features that could distinguish compounds in the genus from others in the nucleic acid or protein class are missing from the disclosure. No common structural attributes identify the members of the genus. The general knowledge and level of skill in the art do not supplement the omitted description because specific, not general, guidance is what is needed. Since the disclosure fails to describe the common attributes or characteristics that identify members of the genus, and because the genus is highly variant, SEQ ID NO:6, 7, 9 and 10, or molecules which hybridize to the polynucleotides encoding these SEQ ID NOs (which could be at least thousands of molecules) alone are insufficient to describe the genus. One of skill in the art would reasonable conclude that the disclosure fails to provide a representative number of species to describe the genus. Thus, Applicant was not in possession of the claimed genus at the time the invention was made.

7. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, second paragraph

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

A. Claims 194-256 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 194 recites “elicits” and “modulates.” This is confusing since to elicit a response means to cause a response whereas the term “modulates” refers to causing or inhibiting a response. These limitations should be placed into independent claims. Whereas it is clear how to determine if a compound modulates a response, it is not clear from the claims how to determine if the compound elicits a response. There is not endpoint or conclusion step in claim 194, nor, for example, in claims 229-238 and 246-254 which would allow the artisan to determine what end result would identify the compound as eliciting a response.

B. Claims 194-256 are confusing since the metes and bounds of the term “activation” (e.g. claim 194) are not known. It is not clear what activity is being measured.

C. Claims 198-205 and 209-217 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The phrase “contained in” is unclear. It is not understood if the claim refers to the full-length of the claimed SEQ ID NO, or a fragment thereof which encodes the functional receptor, for which the specification has not described.

D. Claims 207, 208 and 218 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The phrase “in association with” is unclear. It is not understood in what manner T1R2 is “in association with” T1R3.

E. Claim 218 is vague and indefinite since the claim recites “stringent conditions.” It is not known what these conditions are. Nucleic acid molecules which hybridize under conditions of “low” stringency would not necessarily hybridize under conditions of “high” stringency. Furthermore, not all conditions of “high” or “low” stringency, for example, are the same. Therefore, it is required that Applicants amend the

Art Unit: 1647

claims to recite the exact hybridization conditions without using indefinite phrases such as “*for example*” without adding new matter.

F. Claim 220 recites the limitation “said cell.” There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. It is believed claim 220 should depend from claim 219.

8. Provisional Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

A. Claims 194-256 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 194-229 of copending Application No. 10/725,037; claims 194-234 of copending Application No. 10/725,103 and claims 194-235 of copending Application No. 10/725,472. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because The instant application recites a methods of screening using a T1R2/T1R3 dimer. The ‘037 application recites the heteromeric taste receptors. The ‘103 application recites a recombinant cell comprising this dimer. The ‘472 application recites a method of expressing the dimer. Methods of making and using the dimer are obvious over the recombinant cells.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Art Unit: 1647

8. Prior Art

A. No art rejection is being made since, even though the claimed sequences may have been known at the time of filing of the instant application (e.g. US20030036089), no prior art reference teaches the claimed T1R heterodimers, or that they modulate sweet taste. It is noted that the present invention is only being given priority to 09/897,427 (July 3, 2001).

9. Conclusion

A. No claim is allowable.

Advisory information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert Landsman whose telephone number is (571) 272-0888. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 10 AM – 7 PM (eastern).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brenda Brumback can be reached on 571-272-0961. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Robert Landsman
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1647